

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AS  
ADOPTED MOTIONS TO SUSPEND  
THE RULES

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to suspend the rules relating to the following measures be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Monday, May 19, 2008:

House Concurrent Resolution 300, Senate Joint Resolution 17, House Concurrent Resolution 325, House Resolution 1074, H.R. 3323, House Concurrent Resolution 334, House Resolution 1152, House Resolution 1132, House Resolution 1153, House Resolution 1026, H.R. 752, and H.R. 5787.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, applicable titles are amended.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, sundry motions to reconsider are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-115)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2419, the "Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008."

For a year and a half, I have consistently asked that the Congress pass a good farm bill that I can sign. Regrettably, the Congress has failed to do so. At a time of high food prices and record farm income, this bill lacks program reform and fiscal discipline. It continues subsidies for the wealthy and increases farm bill spending by more than \$20 billion, while using budget gimmicks to hide much of the increase. It is inconsistent with our objectives in international trade negotiations, which include securing greater market access for American farmers and ranchers. It would needlessly expand the size and scope of government. Americans sent us to Washington to achieve results and be good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars. This bill violates that fundamental commitment.

In January 2007, my Administration put forward a fiscally responsible farm bill proposal that would improve the safety net for farmers and move current programs toward more market-oriented policies. The bill before me today fails to achieve these important goals.

At a time when net farm income is projected to increase by more than \$28 billion in 1 year, the American tax-

payer should not be forced to subsidize that group of farmers who have adjusted gross incomes of up to \$1.5 million. When commodity prices are at record highs, it is irresponsible to increase government subsidy rates for 15 crops, subsidize additional crops, and provide payments that further distort markets. Instead of better targeting farm programs, this bill eliminates the existing payment limit on marketing loan subsidies.

Now is also not the time to create a new uncapped revenue guarantee that could cost billions of dollars more than advertised. This is on top of a farm bill that is anticipated to cost more than \$600 billion over 10 years. In addition, this bill would force many businesses to prepay their taxes in order to finance the additional spending.

This legislation is also filled with earmarks and other ill-considered provisions. Most notably, H.R. 2419 provides: \$175 million to address water issues for desert lakes; \$250 million for a 400,000-acre land purchase from a private owner; funding and authority for the noncompetitive sale of National Forest land to a ski resort; and \$382 million earmarked for a specific watershed. These earmarks, and the expansion of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements, have no place in the farm bill. Rural and urban Americans alike are frustrated with excessive government spending and the funneling of taxpayer funds for pet projects. This bill will only add to that frustration.

The bill also contains a wide range of other objectionable provisions, including one that restricts our ability to redirect food aid dollars for emergency use at a time of great need globally. The bill does not include the requested authority to buy food in the developing world to save lives. Additionally, provisions in the bill raise serious constitutional concerns. For all the reasons outlined above, I must veto H.R. 2419, and I urge the Congress to extend current law for a year or more.

I veto this bill fully aware that it is rare for a stand-alone farm bill not to receive the President's signature, but my action today is not without precedent. In 1956, President Eisenhower stood firmly on principle, citing high crop subsidies and too much government control of farm programs among the reasons for his veto. President Eisenhower wrote in his veto message, "Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the nation." For similar reasons, I am vetoing the bill before me today.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 21, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1630

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and further would yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask my colleagues to listen up here because this has been a very difficult bill and there has been numerous problems that have developed every day for the last year-and-a-half. I guess it's appropriate that there would be a problem that would be developing today as well.

When the enrolling clerk enrolled the bill to send to the White House, somehow or another they inadvertently, or however it happened, did not include the trade title, title III of the bill, in the official documents that went to the White House. So the President vetoed the bill minus the trade title, title III.

The trade title includes the food aid programs, including McGovern-Dole; it includes the market promotion; the export credit program; the market access program, and it also includes the soft wood lumber certification program.

So we are moving ahead to override the veto that the President has done. But we have this issue that one of the titles is missing from the bill. We have a process after we get through the override to try to deal with that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the President's veto message said that when the commodity prices are high, it's irresponsible to increase government subsidy rates for 15 crops and subsidize additional crops and so forth. We made some adjustments in some of the price supports to try to rebalance the system from what it has been in the past. These were modest, and I think it's questionable that you would use this as one of the items in the veto override.

As I have worked through this process, I spent more time than anybody else talking to the White House, trying to avoid the situation we are in today, where the President has vetoed this bill. I don't know that anybody else has spent more time trying to work with the White House. The problem has been that they keep changing the objections to the bill, and 2 or 3 weeks ago, when we tried to engage the White House to be able to work with them in a negotiating fashion to take into consideration some of their concerns, their position was that, well, they had these demands but they really weren't in a position or willing to negotiate with us.

So we have come to this day where the White House has vetoed this bill,

which I regret. But we have a good bill that I think all of us should be proud of. It maintains a safety net for farmers, by and large, in the way it was done in the 2002 bill. We did make some changes; reductions in crop insurance and some other areas. We included a new disaster program that is paid for, that would be an unusual situation because generally the disaster ad hocs that we have done have not been paid for. So we think we have made some improvements in area.

We responded to the concern of people around the country of food costs and the way food prices have gone up by taking all of the new money, the whole \$10 billion of new money that was put into the bill over and above the baseline and we have put that into nutrition programs. \$10.364 billion in this bill was put into nutrition programs. That includes modernizing and indexing food stamps; \$1.25 billion for food shelves and food banks that are basically bare right now; and also a new fruit and vegetable snack program for folks in low-income schools so that our kids can have healthy snacks and have an alternative to some of the things that they are now snacking on. We also made some changes, as I said, in the commodity area so that we could improve substantially conservation. We have added a specialty crop title to this bill, and we have also added an energy title to this bill.

So we have responded to what we heard when we traveled the country under the leadership of then-Chairman GOODLATTE. We have responded to all of the areas. We think we have a bill that is responsible, that is paid for without tax increases, that puts the priorities where they need to be in this country.

I would ask my colleagues to follow up on the good vote that we had last Wednesday on the bill when it was on the floor and give us the majority today to override the President's veto.

With that, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, of the 30 minutes yielded to me by the gentleman from Minnesota, I would ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona so that he may manage that time as a part of the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the farm bill, and the words before me say "the very same farm bill passed by this body last week with an overwhelming bipartisan majority." Now we find that it is not quite the same farm bill because of an enrolling error or something in the transmission of the document. I certainly hope that we can find an amicable way to make sure that the trade title of this bill, which is an important title, is included in the final

product, whether as a part of a joint resolution or by some other means of adopting that.

This bill was a collaborative effort, crafted by Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol, and is historic in the amount and degree of reform. It costs less than either the House or the Senate bills and ensures Americans will continue to enjoy access to a safe, affordable, and reliable food supply.

Last week, the 318 bipartisan votes in favor of the farm bill sent a clear message: This is a good bill and there is significant support for it. Despite what has been opined by editorial boards throughout the country, this bill contains significant reforms and is the most reform-minded farm bill this body has ever considered. Granted, everyone didn't get exactly what they wanted. We all gave a little and we all got a little. But such is the nature of compromise. Given the diverse nature of a farm bill, it is extremely difficult to manage the scope of needs within the farm bill, and even more difficult when you're not given the resources needed to do so.

This bill contains many of the ideas suggested in the administration's farm bill proposal. Like the administration, we utilized the adjusted gross income to reduce payments to the wealthiest farmers and ranchers. We eliminated the three-entity rule, created a revenue-base countercyclical program, modified and modernized the dairy program, modified planting flexibility rules, increased the efficiency of the crop insurance program, directed funding to the development of cellulosic ethanol, included programs for beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers, and created beneficial interest for the loan programs.

Variations of these measures were included in the administration's proposal. We may not have gone as far as the administration wanted, but these reforms help make this a better bill than the House or Senate farm bills.

It is important to point out that despite comments to the contrary, this bill is completely paid for, without any tax increases. While many throughout the world are feeling the effects of increased food prices, U.S. consumers have been largely insulated from spikes in food prices because many years ago we established a food production system that maintains an adequate supply in good times and in bad. Because it is produced domestically, we know it to be safe and affordable.

This bill ensures that Americans will continue to enjoy the access to a safe, affordable, and reliable food supply, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this farm bill, which moved substantially in the direction that the President asked for, but which did not meet all of his goals. I think we have increased the support for this bill substantially by almost 90 Members in the process, and I urge my colleagues to support this override vote.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we do need a farm bill. It's planting season throughout the country. The farm economy is crucial in regards to the health and well-being of our Nation. It's an integral part of the economic well-being of my home State in Wisconsin. But I always believed that we should have the right type of farm bill, not the wrong type of farm bill before us today.

Merely because the President is not the most popular person in the country today doesn't mean that he is always wrong. I think he is right when he is sending back a veto message telling the Congress today: We can do better. We should do better. We ought not be giving large taxpayer subsidies to wealthy individuals at a time of record commodity prices.

The modicum of reform that is being hailed under the commodity title is barely the illusion of reform. In fact, if you look at the three main subsidy programs that still exist and still continue on this farm bill, the loan deficiency program, the countercyclical, and the direct payment all of them are going up, in practice. They are increasing the loan rates under the LDP program, increasing the target price under the countercyclical, they are expanding the maximum amount allotted under the direct payments from \$40,000 to \$45,000.

While the gentleman from Virginia is correct that there is a little tightening of the adjusted gross payment limit to farm entities, it doesn't come anywhere close to the type of reform that is eminently justifiable in light of farm income and debt to asset ratio.

By the time you allow two entities on the same farm to qualify for these same direct payments, you can have a farm entity with an adjusted gross income of up to \$2.5 million still receiving taxpayer subsidies. What does this mean in regards to production agriculture? It means that based on last year's schedule F tax returns that farmers file to report their income, these so-called reforms under the commodity title might affect two-tenths of 1 percent of producers around the country today. Hardly the type of reform that we should be talking about. Hardly the justification that we can take home and tell the taxpayers that we are doing right by them.

I believed from the beginning that we can still have a farm bill that maintains an important safety net for family farmers throughout the country in case the bottom drops out, in case they run into hard times. And we know how cyclical farm economy is. We can find savings under those subsidy programs through the reforms that are justifiable to have a strong conservation title coming out of this, strong nutrition title, research and marketing for specialty crops, and having a strong rural economic development program, not to mention the energy title that was alluded to.

In talking to one of my colleagues earlier this afternoon, he says he is reminded by an old Clint Eastwood film: *The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*. There's plenty of good that you can point to in this farm bill. Certainly the increase in nutrition is justifiable in light of rising costs and eligibility and to combat hunger that is rising throughout the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KIND. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The bad is the fact that last year when we passed the farm bill out, they were talking about an increase of \$5.7 billion of funding under the conservation title. Today, coming back, it's less than a \$4 billion increase.

Why is this important? It's important because the increase of commodity prices, there's great pressure on sensitive lands to bring them back into production, and that means it's going to affect wildlife habitat, highly erodible land with sediment and nutrient flows flowing off and contaminating our water and drinking supply. We are seeing already that CRP enrollment is dropping because farmers are choosing to take that out of CRP and putting it back into production. Instead of recognizing market forces and having the strongest possible conservation title, that was one area where they went for further savings in order to protect these large subsidies.

Finally, the Washington Post reported in an article today, *Farm Bill Subsidy Costs May Rise. Billions More Could Be Paid Through Little-Notice Provisions*. This is that new revenue-based countercyclical program the gentleman from Virginia just alluded to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KIND. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

This is based on a 2-year rolling average of commodity prices rather than 5 years that the administration was proposing. But even 2 years ago, commodity prices were at or near record lows. What this means is that it will take very little for the prices to drop today for this program to get triggered and for tens of billions of dollars to be flowing out in further subsidy programs because of the way this is structured, and that is wrong. And we should be more honest, not only with the Members of this Congress of how it's going to work, but with the American taxpayer.

One farm economist called this new ACRE program, and I quote, "lucrative beyond expectations." That is what has been created. So instead of reform, we are heading in the opposite direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

□ 1645

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference re-

port, but I certainly want to thank our ranking member for taking a product and making it better.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the front page of *USA Today* talks about taxpayers' bill leaps by billions, long-term financial obligations of the Federal Government grew by \$2.5 trillion last year, unfunded obligations that will be placed on our children and grandchildren.

Today we have a conference report for a farm bill that is going to cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$700 billion. Now, I have heard it said, well, this bill is paid for. Yes, it is paid for. It is paid for by the auto mechanics in Garland, Texas. It is paid for by the guy that sweeps out the grocery store in Mineola. It is paid for by the guy who works at the counter at the hardware store in Canton, Texas, that I have the privilege of representing.

We have a farm program that in many ways is at odds with the poster child that is represented. Two-thirds of this bill isn't about agriculture. It is about nutritional programs, welfare programs, food stamps. And of the money that is going to agricultural production, two-thirds of agricultural production is not getting anything. And yet some of this money is going, as we know, to millionaires, at a time when middle-income family paychecks are shrinking.

Now, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, this is a debate that is somewhat personal to me. I grew up working on a family farm. I come from three generations of farmers. No one sought a subsidy from their neighbor. No one gave a subsidy. You can make a living in agriculture without asking your neighbor to give you a check.

We do need a farm bill, but what needs to be in a farm bill is tax relief, to prevent taxes from being increased. We need an end to the death tax. We need to increase trade opportunities. We could be exporting good Texas beef right now to Colombia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HENSARLING. We do need a farm bill, but not a farm bill that forces our neighbors to subsidize this program. Ninety-six percent of the world lives outside of America, and already we had the Democrat majority deny a trade agreement that could have opened up great trading opportunities for agriculture in America.

We need a respect for private property rights. We need regulatory relief. When we have an EPA out of control trying to somehow deign animal manure as part of the Superfund hazardous waste site, you know that something is out of control.

So our agricultural producers need help. But this is the wrong way to do it. Again, at a time of shrinking paychecks, at a time when \$2.5 trillion of burden have been added to our children

and grandchildren, why are we keeping alive a relic of the New Deal, not to mention at a time of the highest food inflation in almost two decades. And why we would take money away from some people to hand to millionaires is beyond me.

We ought to defeat this conference report.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished vice chairman of our committee and also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy, and Research, Mr. HOLDEN from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the farm bill and I rise to congratulate and commend the chairman and ranking member of the committee, and really all the members of the committee and the staff.

I think this is a shining example of how this House should work its will. This bill is bipartisan. This bill has been worked together by both sides of the aisle as we traveled around the country and listened to what producers had to say and people concerned about conservation and every title of this bill as we put this together.

This bill reflects the diversity that we have in agriculture all across this country. No one can say they got 100 percent of everything they wanted in this bill, but every region of the country has benefited from this legislation.

As was spoken about previously in the commodity title, there has been significant reform in the commodity title. Could we have gone further? Maybe we could have, but we would have lost votes in other regions of the country. In the conservation title, there is an additional \$4 billion in investment in conservation that will be beneficial all across the country.

In my short time here, Mr. Speaker, the one point I would like to make is that throughout this whole day we have been hearing an awful lot of people talking about the need for the Congress to do more for energy independence. This bill reflects that with the energy title.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), a subcommittee ranking member.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for not only the time, but for his leadership, as well as the chairman, Mr. PETERSON, on this important farm bill.

I heard some of my colleagues say this is not a good farm bill. But, do you know what? Seventy-five percent of our colleagues here in the House thought this was a good farm bill. Eighty-five percent of the Members in the Senate thought this was a good farm bill. And do you know why they thought it was a good farm bill? It is because they understand how important American agriculture is to our country.

One of the things that we were listening to today, oil prices again set another record price today. Why? Because there is not enough oil to meet the demand for our country. There is a mentality going around here that maybe if we just don't produce things, things will just show up. But if we are going to eat feed and clothe America, we have to produce something. If you are going to get something, you have to produce something.

So what this farm bill does is it allows American agriculture to continue to do what it has been doing for hundreds of years, and that is produce the highest quality, the most affordable food and fiber in the world. It is the reason today demand for a lot of American agricultural products are at an all-time high. With the cheap dollar, you can buy the best for a lot less.

What is important here is that we have a future for American agriculture, because we don't want to be in the same shape we are today. We had to wake up today and figure out who is going to supply energy for America. The American people don't want us to have to wake up tomorrow and say who will feed us, who will clothe us, because we have let American agriculture die in America.

So this bill, the reason I support it and why I encourage my colleagues to override this presidential veto, is because it is a good bill. Yes, it is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. A lot of bipartisan work and bicameral work was done to bring this product to the floor, and that is the reason it is important now that we do what American agriculture has been waiting several months for us to do, is finally put in place permanent policy for American agriculture. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, if this represents reform, I would hate to see what the Ag Committee calls a boondoggle. We have here not just a continuation of all the programs we had before, some even at higher levels; we have a new program.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned, there was an article in the Washington Post today detailing the ACRE program. The ACRE program is a new program where subsidies will kick in at far higher levels than they ever have before. In fact, just take corn, for example. If corn hits \$3.50 a bushel, where it was just a year or two ago, at historic highs for the time, if we hit that again, that will trigger subsidies totaling about \$10 billion a year, in addition to everything we are doing today.

That is not reform. That is far away from reform, and how somebody can stand up today and with a straight face say this is reform, I just don't know.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to control the time on behalf of Mr. PETERSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the chairman of the Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Subcommittee.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the stand-in chairman for the moment. Mr. GOODLATTE, thank you again for your hard work, and everybody else who participate in this process. I thank my ranking member helping on the Livestock Committee. Robin, I appreciate your work as well.

We do have a new livestock title. It is the first time ever. It offers producers much-needed protection and ensures fairness and transparency within the marketplace. And as I look at the support we gave when we passed the bill, the 318 here, 81 in the other body, and then the 1,000 organizations that have sent letters supporting us to do this override, why, it seems to me like there is a lot of need to get this done.

So, in short, I think we have got the best we can do under the circumstances. It is bipartisan. I appreciate the efforts, and I recommend the override.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman from Arizona about the ACRE program. This is a program that was requested by the administration. It was modified by the House and modified by the Senate. Now we hear the administration doesn't like the way it is projected to work, but, quite frankly, it scores by the Congressional Budget Office as saving the taxpayers of our country \$400 million.

Why? Because the fact of the matter is it is not expected to have a very high enrollment, and in order to have what the gentleman describe take place, we would have to have a dramatic drop in corn prices. But the administration just signed into law in December a bill that mandates ever-increasing costs of amounts of production for ethanol, and the fact of the matter is we are not going to see those conditions. It is a theoretical possibility, a practical unlikely condition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years I have worked with Southwest Louisiana farmers to deliver a sound and responsible farm bill, and I am glad to report that our hard work has finally paid off with a bipartisan bill.

This important piece of legislation is a victory for farmers in rural communities throughout Louisiana and around the country, but the President failed to see it this way. And I understand his arguments. This is not a perfect bill, but it does make important reforms with a hard cap on farm and nutrition programs.

The hard work of farmers and ranchers across our region maintains America's food security. Ensuring that we have access to safe quality food is critical, and American farmers lead the way. This farm bill supports American farmers going through tough times, while not burdening them during good times. This farm bill supports the agriculture community and ensures its competitiveness in the years to come.

This has been a long process, but in the end we were able to come together and support a bipartisan, responsible farm bill. I am proud of the work we accomplished on this farm bill, and I am grateful to all of those in Southwest Louisiana who helped me with it.

I urge my colleagues to override the veto and vote for American farmers.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, for 1 minute.

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for their hard work. They worked together in a bipartisan manner. I rise today in support of the veto override of H.R. 2419.

Last week, this legislation was passed on a bipartisan vote in this House and by an overwhelming vote in the other body, and I am saddened that this President, a man who represents himself as a friend of agriculture, would choose to turn his back on our Nation's farmers and rural America by vetoing one of the most important pieces of agricultural legislation that this Congress has passed this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we have a stable farm policy in this Nation, not just for farmers, but for every child that participates in a nutrition program, for every food bank, for every school lunch program. This legislation affects every citizen in this country.

This is a bill that we can be proud of, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto. It is a vote for America.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the gentleman from Virginia responding to my statement about the ACRE program and the potential for taxpayer liability here.

The reason that the CBO scored it as a net savings is because of what is called baseline shopping. It was done with this bill, where we actually reached back and chose to base the bill on a baseline, a prior year baseline, when corn prices, when wheat prices, when soybean prices weren't as high. Had we used this year's baseline or this year's projections, then we would see that next year, for example, when this kicks in, that you could have corn at \$4.25 a bushel still receiving subsidies.

Now, keep in mind \$4.25 is higher than corn has ever been, until this year.

□ 1700

And so dropping back to just what it was before this year will trigger subsidies that would not have been triggered before. That is not reform. That is not reform at all. That is soaking the taxpayers. That is farming the taxpayers rather than the land.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman. I applaud your hard work on this farm bill and Chairman PETERSON's.

Every day we are reminded of our problems that we are facing because we rely on foreign nations for our energy supply. I believe that Americans ought to think about what happened with the pet food issue and realize that we need a safe and reliable food supply.

As we worked on this farm bill, we had demands from the Speaker of the House, we had demands from the White House. Serving in the minority there was the tension between my party and the other party in the Senate and the House. We had a great deal of difficulties to overcome. But I am proud today to say that I stand in support of this farm bill and urge my colleagues to join me in overriding this veto.

This farm bill increases funding to food banks that are seeing more and more people come in, needy people. It increases that funding by \$1.2 billion. The farm bill increases dollars for conservation programs that are so important in this Nation. The farm bill increases investment in alternative energy research. Americans want to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

When we are concerned at this time in our Nation about childhood obesity and diabetes, this farm bill increases dollars for nutrition programs for school children around the Nation. And, most importantly, it provides a safety net for rural America.

As we look at what Americans spend on their food supply, 10 percent of their disposable income, we are truly blessed in this world to have this safe, abundant food supply, and we want this to continue. Despite what has been said on this House floor today, this farm bill contains real reform, and we are moving in the right direction with that.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to join me as we override this President's veto.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a strong advocate of reform and conservation in this farm bill, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate his leadership. It is a pleasure to be here with my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) as we are going back to review some of what we said was going to hap-

pen when we were here a week ago. Remember, we talked about what would happen: As the light of day shone on this bill, there would be more things that would come up that would give pause.

Now I have had my differences with President Bush from time to time, but he did the right thing by putting the spotlight on this bill by vetoing it. As has been pointed out by my colleagues, we found out just in the course of the last couple of days something that wasn't clearly explained on the floor, how as the high commodity prices declined to more typical levels, we could end up paying an additional \$16 billion of subsidy.

This bill simply is a missed opportunity for real reform. It is not turning your back on America's farmers and ranchers to suggest, as some of us have and the President argues, that you are limited to \$200,000 a year of income before subsidies kick in. At a time of record commodity food prices, farm couples earning up to \$1.5 million a year with an additional up to \$1 million outside income simply don't need to receive government subsidy. Meanwhile, the majority of farmers who don't grow the commodity crops are going to continue to get little or no money.

It hurts a State like mine, the State of Oregon, where we are proud of what our ranchers and farmers do. But the majority of them get nothing under the existing farm bill and they will continue to get nothing under this proposal.

It troubles me that we are creating a new permanent disaster program, an additional layer of subsidy, which doesn't make sense. If a region is representing repeat disaster year after year after year, it is not really a disaster. It is growing the wrong things using the wrong techniques in the wrong places. We shouldn't turn it into an entitlement.

This bill is a missed opportunity for conservation. The National Wildlife Federation has called the farm bill a disaster for wildlife that "fans the flames of global warming." The funding for conservation is not nearly enough to meet the needs. They are not met today. The majority will not be met under this bill. And, sadly, it makes cuts to important programs like the conservation reserve program, the wetland reserve program. I am disappointed that it also guts the sod saver program that protects important prairie and grassland habitat.

I mentioned last time that I was on the floor that this bill nullifies a Federal appeals court decision under the Freedom of Information Act that ordered USDA to make public data that is critical to monitoring the economic and environmental impacts of these subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. KIND. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Nobody talked about this on the floor, drawing the veil over this information. It was inserted without public hearings, without debate, and will have serious oversight ramifications on how we manage these programs. Nineteen congressional districts in the country will get about half the money. They make out grandly. But States with strong agricultural communities will continue to be shortchanged.

Congress could have done a better job for the environment, could have concentrated the help on the majority of farmers who are shortchanged to help them and their communities. Small- and medium-sized farmers will continue to be squeezed away. If we pass this bill, do not sustain the veto, we will continue to have large operations squeezing out small and medium-sized operations. If we can't muster reform with these record high prices, we probably never will. The President was right to veto it. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support him and go back and do it right.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry Subcommittee, who did such an outstanding job in putting the much needed nutrition title together, Mr. BACA from California.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opinion in support of this farm bill, and urge my colleagues to override the President's veto.

Simply put, this farm bill strengthens our nutrition, conservation, energy independence, and specialty crops like no other farm bill has ever done before, and it is done in a bipartisan fashion.

People asked us to come here in Washington, D.C. and vote on a bipartisan, not to vote on a partisan. We have come together on a bipartisan.

This currently will feed 38 million Americans who do not have enough to eat. We are in an economic recession. People have lost their jobs. People have lost their homes because of foreclosures. Gas prices are going up. This farm bill will put food on the table for over 13 million American families. We have raised the food stamp benefit index to keep up with the lost of living. These changes will help an additional 10 million Americans, including poor working families, the elderly, the disabled, and the veterans.

We expanded the USDA snack programs under the fresh fruits and vegetables. We will leave no child behind. This will feed them.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and override the President. This is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman.

Earlier someone indicated that we had thousands of supporters, thousands

of groups supporting this bill. Who couldn't get thousands of groups to support a bill by paying them \$300 billion in subsidies?

We are poised here to pass a record-breaking, multibillion-dollar, Soviet-style central planning farm bill that takes tax dollars away from the general public and doles them out to a few people in the agricultural industry, some of them millionaires, at a time when crop prices are breaking records.

What benefit do the American taxpayers get from this bill? They get higher taxes for the privilege of paying artificially higher food prices. What a deal.

Mr. Speaker, when oil prices hit record highs, the Democrat leadership and some Republicans called for the imposition of a windfall profits tax on greedy evil oil producers. But when crop prices skyrocket, the same leadership comes to the floor of this House to hand out billions of dollars in subsidies to big agricultural businesses and wealthy hobby farmers.

America, what a country. Washington, what a disaster.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Horticulture and Organic Agriculture Subcommittee who brought us the first specialty crop title to the farm bill, Mr. CARDOZA of California.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, I thank him for his leadership and for allowing us to write this bill the way we did, including specialty crops. And I rise in strong support of overriding the misguided Presidential veto on the Farm, Conservation and Energy Act.

It is extremely unfortunate that we must go through this exercise on legislation that is so critically important to both rural and urban America alike. The bipartisan conference report on the 2008 farm bill represents the blood, sweat, and tears of many members on this floor and of the other body of the agriculture committees and including myself. We have made significant reforms, preserved the safety net for American farmers, and dramatically increased domestic nutrition assistance. And for the first time in history we have given specialty crops a seat at the table. We did all of this, and we complied with the PAYGO rules of this House.

It is not a perfect bill. There are some who would have preferred more conservation spending or more reforms. However, the 2008 farm bill is the product of hard work and compromise, and should not be discounted simply because we could not meet the unrealistic, impractical, and unworkable benchmarks set by the administration.

I take particularly strong exception to the President's repeated insistence in the farm bill that it must be vetoed in the name of international trade agreements. Meeting our global trade obligations should never trump critical

domestic priorities. Our farmers have the capacity for immeasurable innovation and success, and they deserve our commitment and our support, and it is done in this farm bill.

The President has let down American agriculture today, and that is just a shame. But I am confident that, together with the Senate, we can override this veto today and make good on our promise to protect American farmers and ranchers. I strongly urge my colleagues to override this veto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 8½ minutes; the gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes; the gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes; the gentleman from Arizona has 4 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLE).

Mr. KUHLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of the farm bill.

When I was elected to Congress, I joined the Agriculture Committee because of my district's rich and deep tradition in farming. And as a member of this committee, I am committed to serving not only the needs of my district, but also to preserving our Nation's agricultural vitality. As such, I am extremely disappointed by the President's veto.

I am very pleased, however, by what our committee has been able to do in writing this farm bill. This farm bill fairly and accurately represents the interests of all our farmers and various agricultural industries across the country and was fashioned in a bipartisan manner. Particularly the dairy and specialty crops and conservation programs will be extremely beneficial to New York farmers. But, more importantly, this legislation contains reform.

For the first time in history there will be a hard cap on the adjusted gross income standard to prevent the wealthiest from receiving payments. As such, this farm bill has broad support from a variety of agricultural, nutrition, conservation, and consumer entities. This farm bill is an opportunity to make American farm policy truly comprehensive, competitive and cohesive, and I urge my colleagues in Congress to override this veto.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to recognize an outstanding member of our conference committee, also a member of the Ag Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman, Mr. Speaker, this bill requires our urgent action to override the President's veto. The American people are concerned about many, many things, but they are most concerned about the high cost of food and the high cost of gasoline. And as soon as this bill is made into law, we

will deal with these two issues right away.

The first thing that this bill does to address the high cost of food and the high cost of gasoline is that we immediately look at the corn-based ethanol, and we reduce the tax credits on corn-based ethanol and we increase the tax credits on ethanol made from cellulosic materials, which are switch grass and pine straw.

The other reason why we need to make sure we override this veto is simply because, Mr. Speaker, this bill will reach out and bring in individual segments of our population that were left out. The African American farmers are entitled to their due, and this bill will require that African American farmers who in the past have been discriminated against will have this, and it provides millions of dollars for traditionally African American schools. That is why it is important that we override the veto of this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

□ 1715

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of the farm bill. It's a widely held axiom that good agriculture policy is good Federal policy. This farm bill is a fulfillment of that statement.

This legislation will continue a safety net for America's producers and consumers, while providing a proper return on investment to the American taxpayer. The food and fiber commodity market is an extremely unpredictable place in which our producers have no ability to set their prices for their products.

Furthermore, farmers and ranchers in all areas of the world are forced to deal with uncontrollable production risks that could at any time wipe out an entire year's income at a moment's notice. These are fundamentals that will never change, and I firmly believe that we'll always have a need for policies and mechanisms to address these issues.

This long overdue and extremely important piece of legislation, once law, will return a sense of certainty to farmers and ranchers of rural America.

The farm bill has an important impact on every single American, and I strongly support this bipartisan act, and urge my colleagues to override the President's veto.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to come to the floor today to talk about how bad this bill is, but it's impossible not to do that.

This bill gives millions of dollars, billions of dollars in farm subsidies to millionaires. This bill takes all budget discipline in this Chamber and throws it out the window. It sweeps PAYGO under the rug.



Ninety-seven percent of the world's consumers don't live in this country. They're overseas. And the way we help farmers is to open up markets to their products overseas. This bill shuts that down. This bill makes it next to impossible for us to be able to open up markets for our farmers.

A farm bill ought to help the family farmer in tough times. This doesn't do that. This is corporate welfare. This is subsidies for multi-millionaires. In fact, you can still live on Wall Street, make half a million dollars and get farm subsidies under this bill.

This bill is not going to help agriculture. This bill is going to help corporate agriculture, not family farmers.

I believe that we should sustain the President's veto. And this is not always good to say it's bipartisan. And I hope, on a bipartisan basis, we support this veto and pass a farm bill that actually helps the family farmer and takes away these exorbitant subsidies to multi-millionaire corporate farming operations.

We ought to protect conservation. We ought to help the Third World raise themselves out of poverty, and we ought to open up markets for our farmers so they have more people to sell their products to. That's what a farm bill ought to look like. That's not what this farm bill does.

I urge a sustain of the veto.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) who is a member of both the Ways and Means Committee and Agriculture Committee, and did an outstanding job in helping us put this bill together.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the chairman. The rhetoric is a little overblown against this bill, as it was the first time it was before us, as it was when we passed it on final passage.

The fact is, this bill spends billions less than the last farm bill. This bill increases the baseline on conservation, and this bill is the result of some of the best bipartisan activity I've seen in this place to develop and produce a fine product. It responds to the needs of consumers having a hard time buying their groceries with increased nutrition support. It responds to the struggles of family farmers meeting the incredibly high cost of getting their crop in with better risk protection, and it does so in a collaborative measure.

As my friend, BOB GOODLATTE, said last week, this isn't Republicans voting for a Democrat farm bill, this is the parties coming together to build a strong collaborative product.

I urge us to override the President's veto of this very important bill for rural America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a ranking member on the Agriculture Subcommittee, Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to over-

ride the President's veto. As I told you a few days ago, not everything in this bill do I love. But the fact of the matter is, I love rural America. And production agriculture and those small towns and all those good people who live out there who work the land and raise the stock, provide the food and fiber that feeds and clothes us all. And they know that we need a comprehensive farm bill. They know how important it is that we provide the resources to meet the needs of this country.

Now, 75 percent of this bill goes to the food stamp program, the feeding programs. They understand that in rural America. They want to make sure all of our fellow citizens have enough to eat.

But they also know that they fight the weather, they're paying more for diesel and fertilizer and inputs than they ever have or they may ever again. But they want to raise those crops, and they want a comprehensive farm bill that provides a reasonable amount of safety net to allow them to work with their bankers and financiers.

Vote to override the veto for the future of rural America.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to one of our new outstanding freshmen on the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY) who represents a very big agriculture district and has done outstanding work for us.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I've read the President's reasons for vetoing this farm bill, and it's clear that even though he owns a ranch, he's not a rancher. It's clear he doesn't understand that to have national security, America needs food security. It's clear that while the White House whines about crop subsidies, that his administration's failed economic policies have resulted in \$4 per gallon diesel and skyrocketing fertilizer costs that are driving farmers in Florida out of business.

Although not perfect, this farm bill, for the first time, gives Florida agriculture some of the monies we need to help market and protect our crops. It ensures that our Nation's hungry children and seniors get Florida's fresh fruit and vegetables. It invests in conservation that will speed up our efforts to save the Everglades.

Finally, this farm bill, in combination with the energy bill, provides rural Florida a new beginning by breaking the corn ethanol monopoly, and ensuring that Florida, the biggest biomass producing State in the Nation, takes its rightful place as a leader in renewable energy production.

I call on my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the average U.S. farmer provides enough food and fiber for 143 persons, both here in the United States and internationally. This new farm bill continues agricultural policies which have allowed America's farmers to help feed the world.

I believe that the farm bill promotes agricultural stability and diversification, agriculture-based renewable energy production, and good conservation and land stewardship practices. As with any complicated piece of legislation, there are trade-offs and concerns. For instance, payment limitation reform progressed, but did not go far enough in my view. Even though I'm going to vote to override the President's veto, I do commend the administration for its considerable efforts to highlight the need for reform, particularly in the area of payment limitations.

I'm also pleased that the farm bill conference report includes three of my initiatives. First, a new rural energy self-sufficiency initiative that would provide grants to rural communities seeking to become energy self-sufficient through the use of renewable sources such as wind and solar and biofuels and biomass.

Additionally, there is a new provision allowing school systems and other governmental institutions to purchase local foods from local farmers, promoting agricultural sustainability and diversification.

And there is a change to the value-added producer grants program that would help target assistance to farmers with small or mid-sized farms who develop new uses and creative marketing strategies for their product.

Mr. Speaker, the development of this important legislation has taken several years. This ground has been plowed long enough. I believe this bill deserves merit. I wish to thank our ranking member, Chairman GOODLATTE, for his support of this bill and Chairman PETERSON as well for his considerable efforts.

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to address some of the comments that have been made. It's been said several times that this bill is good because it's a bipartisan bill. If this is the standard by which we judge legislation, then we're doing pretty poorly in this House.

If anybody remembers, just a couple of years ago, the infamous bill that brought us the Bridge to Nowhere. Do you want to know how bipartisan that bill was? I believe it was 412 votes for, 8 votes against. If that isn't bipartisan, what is?

Yet who would want that vote back if they could? 6,300 earmarks, with a lot of bad ones, including the infamous Bridge to Nowhere. And yet we laud legislation simply because it's bipartisan.

I would love to see a lot more partisanship in this House when it comes to fiscal discipline. I wish that my

party, the Republican Party, would stand up and say, anybody who believes in limited government cannot support a bill like this, a \$300 billion bill that is bipartisan because so many groups are now involved.

You do a specialty crop title; you add another subsidy program called ACRE, you get biomass in it, you get cellulosic ethanol, you add another nutrition program, and pretty soon you have so many people in it that they don't dare vote against it, and it just gets bigger and bigger and bigger, and pretty soon you have a \$300 billion bill that you can only pay for by shopping for a baseline other than this year's baseline, and waive PAYGO requirements. That's why this is a bipartisan bill.

I would hope, in a week where a major news organization published, and I hope it set off some alarm bells here, that not only do we have about 9 or \$10 trillion in debt, but when you add in the unfunded liabilities, it adds up to about a half a million dollars per person in this country, the amount of debt and unfunded obligation that we're on the hook for.

If we cannot, in this legislation, tell a farm entity, a farm couple that earns as much as \$2.5 million that they can no longer collect farm subsidies, how in the world are you going to tell a grandmother, you're going to have to postpone your retirement for a couple of years because we can't afford your Social Security payment?

How in the world are you going to tell somebody, you know, you're going to have to have a higher copay on Medicare for prescription drugs because we have a big farm bill like this?

We need to be more responsible, and I would urge us to sustain the President's veto.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5½ minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from Missouri, a real advocate for agriculture, Mr. HULSHOF.

(Mr. HULSHOF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, the President has, for the second time, vetoed a bill that would help Midwestern farmers. Once again, I rise to vote for Missouri's family farmers and to override President's veto.

I think it's interesting that for over a year, opponents have said prices are high, farmers don't need a safety net, as if we can predict with certainty the market price of commodities 5 years down the road.

Today those opponents claim prices may drop, causing the safety net to be too expensive. Well, with all respect, which is it?

Sixteen percent of this bill provides a responsible safety net for farmers when the market turns south. And let's make no mistake. Farmers don't want to farm for a government check. Farmers want to farm for the market.

And what is the cost to the American taxpayer? Six cents a day. In my mind, six cents a day is not too much to pay to ensure that we continue to have the safest, most abundant food supply at the lowest cost.

Now, we have seen what happens when we offshore or energy production. What will happen when we offshore our food production? Thank the Lord above, literally, thank the Lord above that we can put three square meals a day on our tables from the bounty of our country's own farmers.

This bill is not perfect. It doesn't contain all the reforms that the other side would want. But under their plan, which failed 117-309, most of the farms and ranches would not be able to survive the erosion in farm income. That's according to the Agriculture and Food Policy Center at Texas A&M.

Some people just can't take yes for an answer. 1,054 organizations, from MoveOn.Org to the USA Rice Federation, support this bill.

I know it's tough to do, but I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto and provide this safety net. And I appreciate the gentleman for the time.

□ 1730

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a good friend of the Agricultural Committee, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished chairman. Let me rise to indicate the broad opposition to the veto of the President on this agricultural bill, and I'm going to try to rush through some very vital issues that are of concern to many of us.

I just came back from Haiti and recognized the crisis that our very good friend and neighbor, the poorest country in the western hemisphere. The good news is that President Preval, who asked us to create an opportunity for jobs in a country that is hungry and lacks jobs, the Haiti trade provisions were in the bill, but unfortunately vetoed which causes us an urgent necessity to override this veto. The Caribbean Basin Initiative extension is a vital part.

But yet I look forward to us fixing the parts that included the trade title that left out the food aid, very important; McGovern-Dole, which is food for education; giving girls the incentives to come to school. And then the market access problems that are crucial.

We know there are 850 million hungry people in the world; 300 million of them are children; 40 percent of those in Haiti eat one meal a day. We are in a crisis.

This is a crucial legislative initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. So what we are talking about here, I think there is something important to bipartisanship. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, thank you for this. I've lived around the edges of the agriculture bill ever since I came here from Texas. We know about specialty crops. We know about ranches and farms. I think you did a great job for these fruits and vegetable farmers because you give them an incentive to get to market.

And thank you for what you've done for the black farmers, especially on Pigford, where you allowed those late filers—I've always heard from them throughout the work on the Judiciary Committee to get back in the court by being able to file again. We are delighted that you also give them a greater access; you allow them to have transparency and accountability in the USDA, and I'm glad that what we do is try to preserve the black farmers.

This is an important bill. Let's fix the trade part of it, but let's join together and override a bill that promotes energy and food and understands you can't have a food fight when people are starving.

I urge our colleagues to vote to override the veto.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said here today about the bipartisan nature of this legislation, but when it passed the House last week, a majority on both sides of the aisle voted for this farm bill, and three-quarters of all of the Members here did so. But we did so because there are provisions in this bill that are of interest to each side of the aisle, and sometimes there are very clear partisan differences.

But nonetheless, the Republican side of the aisle received a number of concessions in the final negotiations of this bill: a provision that would have prohibited all 50 State food stamp programs to be able to reach out to technology companies and others to modernize and improve their food stamp program, something they have done many times in the recent past. A prohibition on that was removed from the bill. A provision in the bill that would have rolled back the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 and provided increased food stamps for able-bodied adults without dependent children was removed from the bill. Provisions related to the Davis-Bacon legislation that many Members on my side of the aisle, including myself, were concerned about were removed from the bill.

So this is a bipartisan bill because it was compromise and give-and-take on both sides of the aisle.

I have also heard Members complain that this bill is not fiscally responsible. It's less than the last farm bill. It is less than either the House-passed



version of the bill or the Senate-passed version of the bill: \$4 billion less than the House, \$5 billion less than the Senate version. I ask any Member here in the House, when was the last time they recall that a bill came back from a conference between the House and the Senate and spent less money than either the House or Senate spent?

And I would give you this overall picture. Americans spend about \$1.2 trillion a year on food. The provisions in this bill related to the commodity title, the safety net for America's farmers and ranchers, is about \$7 billion or slightly less than one-half of 1 percent of what Americans spend on food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Now for that one-half cent on every dollar, Americans get the stability and safety of their food supply and the assurance that they will not see in the United States what they're seeing in other countries around the world which do not have a good farm program for their farmers that assure their consumers that they will get an adequate, safe, and affordable supply of food. They do not see food riots in the United States.

They see, instead, those in the greatest need receiving appropriate food programs and the average American being able to spend less than 9 percent of their income on food. That is lower than any other country in the world today or any other country in the history of the world.

This farm bill helps to promote those good policies. I urge my colleagues to support the override.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, under of the commodity title of the current bill, we still have loan deficiency programs in place, countercyclical programs, another \$25 billion of direct payments that will go out over the next 5 years regardless of price or production. A new revenue-based countercyclical program has been added to it. And then the granddaddy of all earmarks, a disaster relief fund has been created, all of which have been reformed upwards rather than down, rather than restricting it.

I think the gentleman I talked to earlier is right. This can be described as the good, the bad, and the ugly farm bill. Unfortunately, the ugly outweighs the good here today. But, of course, whenever you go \$10.5 billion above current baseline and put enough money around and enough groups with enough individuals, you're going to get a strong vote. We understand that.

But someone needs to stand up here today on behalf of the American taxpayer. Someone needs to stand here in the Chamber and say the emperor has no clothes. This farm bill will continue to distort the marketplace. It will continue to paint a bull's-eye on the back

of our farmers through trade-distorting policies. And I would encourage my colleagues, if they took another look, a closer look at what's being proposed here today, they would understand that we can and should do a better job.

I would encourage my colleagues to sustain the President's veto and do the farm bill the right way, not the wrong way.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people make a lot of claims about this bill. Editorial writers, most of them get the information wrong. But as has been mentioned here before, 15 percent of the bill goes to farmers; 9 percent of that goes to traditional commodity type programs; the balance of it to crop insurance and the new disaster program; 73½ percent of this bill goes to nutrition programs, while 7 percent goes to conservation.

So you can talk all you want about the bull's-eye on the back of the farmers, but people need to understand that the European Union now is having discussion to get rid of their direct payments and increase their commodity price supports similar to what we have here in the United States. And there are people in this country that would like to do this as well. This ideology that's been pushed by the World Bank, the IMF, all of these other world organizations, is part of the reason we're in trouble in this country and in the world.

We have, not just us but countries all over the world, have sold food below the cost of our production. Some of our opponents want us to keep doing this. I understand if you're a livestock farmer you want to keep buying cheap corn. But we've addicted these folks in these developing countries to cheap food prices. Now that we're getting prices that are more realistic, all of a sudden it's a problem because they didn't develop their own agriculture. They got hooked on exports from the United States and from other countries.

What we're doing in this bill is recognizing all of the different aspects of this country, not just farm country, not just farmers, but people in the city, people in the suburbs, people that like to hunt and fish, people that are concerned about the environment, people that are concerned about getting nutritious food into our schools and having more fresh fruit and vegetables available for people around the country, and people that want to get independent from foreign oil. All of these things are covered in this bill.

Are they done to the magnitude that I would like in some areas? No. I would say everybody here would probably agree that they would like to have something a little bit stronger in one area or the other or maybe a little weaker in one area or the other.

But this is a compromise, a bipartisan compromise that I am proud of

the way that we've been able to put together. Mr. GOODLATTE and I sat in that room for many days with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We operated on an equal basis, as Mr. GOODLATTE pointed out. There was give and take. This was a true bipartisan effort. We came up with a true bipartisan bill that we should be proud of that is good for America, that spends less than the last farm bill, that, as Mr. GOODLATTE says, spends less than both bills that passed the House and the Senate. I can't remember a time around here when we've done something like that.

So I encourage my colleagues to take a good look at this bill to understand that this is something that's good for the country. I urge my colleagues to override the veto of the President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto, but I would like to close my remarks by commending the President of the United States and his administration for their involvement in this process. They have improved this farm bill considerably from the versions that were passed in the House and the Senate. In fact, I'm going to yield a portion of my time to the leader.

But I want to say that this includes more than 90 provisions that the President of the United States, the leaders in the Department of Agriculture and others, suggested to us to reform. And there are numerous reforms in this legislation that are very, very substantial, very, very significant. They would not have occurred without the President's active involvement and support for efforts to improve this farm bill.

This farm bill is dramatically reformed from previous farm bills, and as a result of his involvement, of involvement on both sides of the aisle, this farm bill is dramatically improved. As a result, the Republican Members on this side of the aisle went from 17 Members supporting the bill when it came out of the Agriculture Committee to 100 Members supporting it when we voted for it last week.

There is much to commend in this bill. The President has asked for additional reforms. I supported him in the efforts to obtain some of those reforms, but we could not achieve every single objective that he sought because this is a bipartisan bill that includes the considerations of a wide array of viewpoints.

But I will say that this side of the aisle was well represented in this process and thanks in part to the efforts of the administration.

Notwithstanding that, the bill is a good bill, and we would urge our colleagues to support it.

At this time, I yield the balance of my time to the Republican leader, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague for yielding, and I'm not going to talk about the farm bill.

I'm a little concerned and have serious doubts about the process that we're

using to bring this bill considering that the bill that the President vetoed is not the bill that the Members are being asked to override.

Remember, there were 12 titles in the farm bill that we sent to the President. The bill that we have, that we're overriding, contains 11 titles. Title III of the bill is missing.

Now, the reason I rise is because I have got doubts about the process that we're engaged in, and I have doubts about the constitutionality of what it is that we're doing. And people were in such a hurry to bring this bill up here to the floor that no one would take the time to consider what is it that we're doing; is it constitutional, and should we proceed under the conditions we find ourselves.

We don't know why title III of the bill that we sent to the President is missing in the document that we're considering right now.

So it is not just me as a Member. I think there are other Members on both sides of the aisle that are wondering should we proceed with this and is what we're doing constitutional, is it breaking precedent with what we've done in the past. I would just ask my colleagues, and especially ask the majority, why we couldn't take some time to understand what happened in this process, why title III isn't included in the bill that we're moving to override.

And so until there are answers to this, I would suggest to the majority that we ought to consider suspending activity on this until such time as we know we have answers to the questions that Members on both sides are going to have.

□ 1745

I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

As I understand it, it was just a glitch in the printing of the document that went to the White House. They vetoed the bill missing title III and didn't recognize it.

As I understand, the Constitution says that when we have a veto, we are bound to deal with it. So we don't see any other way to deal with this thing at this point other than to deal with the President's veto, have the override and then deal with title III later.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time, I don't know whether the President signed the bill that included title III or not. I don't know where title III fell from the bill. That's the point I'm making.

Until there are answers as to what did happen, how we proceed is critically important to the constitutionality of the process that we're engaged in here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on recon-

sideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passing H.R. 2419, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 3819, H.R. 5826, and H.R. 5856.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 108, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—316

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Capito  
Capps  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Cazayoux  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt

DeLauro  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kildee

Kilpatrick  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Pickering  
Platts  
Poe

Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky

Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Speler  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry

Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weller  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wittman (VA)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

NAYS—108

Akin  
Bachmann  
Barrett (SC)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Blumenauer  
Boehner  
Broun (GA)  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capuano  
Castle  
Chabot  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Cooper  
Culberson  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett (NJ)  
Goode  
Granger  
Harman

Heller  
Hensarling  
Hobson  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Issa  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Keller  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Knollenberg  
Lamborn  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Marchant  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McHenry  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Myrick  
Nunes  
Paul

Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Ramstad  
Reichert  
Rohrabacher  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancred  
Terry  
Tiberi  
Wamp  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (UT)  
Brown, Corrine  
Carter  
Castor

Crenshaw  
Fossella  
Gillibrand  
Kennedy

Rush  
Tiahrt  
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1809

Mrs. GRANGER changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. WOOLSEY and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

### VETERANS EMERGENCY CARE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3819, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3819, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Cazayoux	Franks (AZ)
Ackerman	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Aderholt	Chandler	Gallegly
Akin	Childers	Garrett (NJ)
Alexander	Clarke	Gerlach
Allen	Clay	Giffords
Altmire	Cleaver	Gilchrest
Andrews	Clyburn	Gingrey
Arcuri	Coble	Gohmert
Baca	Cohen	Gonzalez
Bachmann	Cole (OK)	Goode
Bachus	Conaway	Goodlatte
Baird	Conyers	Gordon
Baldwin	Cooper	Granger
Barrett (SC)	Costa	Graves
Barrow	Costello	Green, Al
Bartlett (MD)	Courtney	Green, Gene
Barton (TX)	Cramer	Grijalva
Bean	Crowley	Gutierrez
Becerra	Cubin	Hall (NY)
Berkley	Cuellar	Hall (TX)
Berry	Culberson	Hare
Biggert	Cummings	Harman
Bilbray	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Bishop (NY)	Davis (KY)	Heller
Bishop (UT)	Davis, David	Hensarling
Blackburn	Davis, Lincoln	Herseth Sandlin
Blumenauer	Davis, Tom	Higgins
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hill
Boehner	DeFazio	Hinche
Bonner	DeGette	Hinojosa
Bono Mack	Delahunt	Hirono
Boozman	Dent	Hobson
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Boswell	Dicks	Hoekstra
Boucher	Dingell	Holden
Boustany	Doggett	Holt
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Honda
Boyd (KS)	Doolittle	Hooley
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Drake	Hulshof
Braley (IA)	Dreier	Hunter
Broun (GA)	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Inslee
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Israel
Ginny	Ellison	Issa
Buchanan	Ellsworth	Jackson (IL)
Burgess	Emanuel	Jackson-Lee
Burton (IN)	Emerson	(TX)
Butterfield	Engel	Jefferson
Buyer	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Etheridge	Johnson (IL)
Camp (MI)	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Campbell (CA)	Fallin	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Farr	Jones (NC)
Cantor	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Capito	Feeney	Jordan
Capps	Ferguson	Kagen
Capuano	Filner	Kanjorski
Cardoza	Flake	Kaptur
Carnahan	Forbes	Keller
Carney	Foster	Kildee
Carson	Fox	Kilpatrick
Castle	Frank (MA)	Kind

King (IA)	Murphy, Patrick	Sestak
King (NY)	Murphy, Tim	Shadegg
Kingston	Murtha	Shays
Kirk	Musgrave	Shea-Porter
Klein (FL)	Myrick	Sherman
Kline (MN)	Napolitano	Shimkus
Knollenberg	Neal (MA)	Shuler
Kucinich	Neugebauer	Shuster
Kuhl (NY)	Nunes	Simpson
LaHood	Oberstar	Sires
Lamborn	Obey	Skelton
Lampson	Olver	Slaughter
Langevin	Ortiz	Smith (NE)
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pastor	Smith (WA)
LaTourette	Paul	
Latta	Payne	Snyder
Lee	Pearce	Solis
Levin	Pence	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Perlmutter	Space
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Speier
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Linder	Petri	Stark
Lipinski	Pickering	Stearns
LoBiondo	Pitts	Stupak
Loeback	Platts	Sullivan
Lofgren, Zoe	Poe	Sutton
Lowey	Pomeroy	Tancredo
Lucas	Porter	Tanner
Lungren, Daniel	Price (GA)	Tauscher
E.	Price (NC)	Taylor
Lynch	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Mack	Putnam	Thompson (MS)
Mahoney (FL)	Radanovich	Thornberry
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Tiberi
Manzullo	Ramstad	Tierney
Marchant	Rangel	Towns
Markey	Regula	Tsongas
Marshall	Rehberg	Turner
Matheson	Reichert	Udall (CO)
Matsui	Renzi	Udall (NM)
McCarthy (CA)	Reyes	Upton
McCarthy (NY)	Richardson	Van Hollen
McCaul (TX)	Rodriguez	Velazquez
McCollum (MN)	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McCotter	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
McCrery	Rogers (MI)	Walden (OR)
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Walsh (NY)
McGovern	Roskam	Walz (MN)
McHenry	Ross	Wamp
McIntyre	Rothman	Wasserman
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
McMorris	Royce	Waters
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Watson
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Watt
McNulty	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Meek (FL)	Salazar	Weiner
Meeks (NY)	Sali	Welch (VT)
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Weldon (FL)
Mica	T.	Weller
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Miller (FL)	Sarbanes	Whitfield (KY)
Miller (MI)	Saxton	Wilson (NM)
Miller (NC)	Scalise	Wilson (OH)
Miller, Gary	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
Miller, George	Schiff	Wittman (VA)
Mitchell	Schmidt	Wolf
Mollohan	Schwartz	Woolsey
Moore (KS)	Scott (GA)	Wu
Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Moran (VA)	Serrano	Young (FL)
Murphy (CT)	Sessions	

### NOT VOTING—22

Berman	Fortenberry	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown, Corrine	Fossella	Rush
Carter	Gillibrand	Terry
Castor	Herger	Tiahrt
Crenshaw	Kennedy	Wexler
DeLauro	McHugh	Wynn
Diaz-Balart, M.	Nadler	
English (PA)	Reynolds	

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1816

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 347, unfortunately, during the vote I was unavoidably detained off the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

### VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST- OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5826, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5826.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Capps	Eshoo
Ackerman	Capuano	Etheridge
Aderholt	Cardoza	Everett
Akin	Carnahan	Fallin
Alexander	Carney	Farr
Allen	Carson	Fattah
Altmire	Castle	Feeney
Andrews	Cazayoux	Ferguson
Arcuri	Chabot	Filner
Baca	Chandler	Flake
Bachmann	Childers	Forbes
Bachus	Clarke	Fortenberry
Baird	Clay	Foster
Baldwin	Cleaver	Fox
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Franks (AZ)
Barrow	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett (MD)	Cohen	Gallegly
Barton (TX)	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)
Bean	Conaway	Gerlach
Becerra	Conyers	Giffords
Berkley	Cooper	Gilchrest
Berman	Costa	Gingrey
Berry	Costello	Gohmert
Biggert	Courtney	Gonzalez
Bilbray	Crowley	Goode
Bilirakis	Cubin	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Gordon
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Cummings	Graves
Blackburn	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Blunt	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Gutierrez
Bonner	Davis, David	Hall (NY)
Bono Mack	Davis, Lincoln	Hall (TX)
Boozman	Davis, Tom	Hare
Boren	Deal (GA)	Harman
Boswell	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	DeLauro	Hayes
Boyd (FL)	Dent	Heller
Boyd (KS)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herger
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Herseth Sandlin
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Higgins
Broun (GA)	Doggett	Hill
Brown (SC)	Donnelly	Hinche
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Ginny	Doyle	Hirono
Buchanan	Drake	Hobson
Burgess	Dreier	Hodes
Burton (IN)	Duncan	Hoekstra
Butterfield	Edwards	Holden
Buyer	Ehlers	Holt
Calvert	Ellison	Honda
Camp (MI)	Ellsworth	Hooley
Campbell (CA)	Emanuel	Hoyer
Cannon	Emerson	Hulshof
Cantor	Engel	Hunter
Capito	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)